Approved Flor Ralesse 2003/04/89: GIAIRDR84-10180R006500030008-2-/3-3/

\$ JUN 1975

Deputy Director for Administration Deputy Director for Intelligence MEMORANDUM FOR:

Deputy Director for Operations

Deputy Director for Science and Technology

: Applicant Commitments SUBJECT

In the past few weeks we have had a number of experiences with applicants which left the individuals frustrated and considerably less than satisfied with the way in which the Agency handled their cases. I would like to enlist your aid in trying to prevent future problems of a similar nature.

- In one instance, based on interviews with the component representative, an applicant was so convinced he had a job with us that he declined his current employer's offer of a better position. A combination of factors, none of which by itself was disqualifying, resulted in our determining the applicant unsuitable. Another applicant entered on duty with the expectation of benefits (from interviews outside this office) which he believed had been promised him. He resigned two weeks later when he found that his expectations were not fulfilled.
- These and similar cases suggest that applicants in whom components have a genuine interest are too often given the impression during their invitee interviews that "internal processing" is a formality and "nothing to worry about." As you know, this is not so. Security and medical disapprovals, personality information developed from background investigations, a belated PATB readout, T/O adjustments and ceiling reductions take, in total, a substantial toll of those in process. ignore these potential factors because of a sincere interest in a well qualified applicant can lead to a serious type of Agency problem we can do without.

- 4. The situation is further exacerbated by outside economic conditions. The Agency is receiving literally thousands of applications from well qualified individuals for, at best, a few hundred professional positions. As a result, most of our correspondence consists of "reject" letters to people who are desperately seeking work. Many do not accept their rejection philosophically and subsequently attempt to persuade or pressure for a change of mind. In cases where we have even inadvertently given a rejected applicant grounds to believe the job offer was more firm than intended, we are vulnerable.
- 5. The normal PHS package filled out by an applicant contains papers which clearly set out Agency internal requirements, i.e., thorough background and polygraph investigation, determination of physical fitness and emotional stability. In addition, our initial correspondence with applicants stresses the tentative nature of the job offer. It is only in the ultimate EOD letter that a firm commitment to hire is made. Nonetheless, all eager applicants are "selective listeners" to at least some degree. They grasp that part of any discussion that might seem to constitute an offer.
- 6. The selective listener is one thing but an applicant who, in fact, has been overly encouraged by a component interviewer is another. We believe there is enough frequency in the latter occurrence to warrant your bringing the matter to the attention of your Office Heads. We ask for emphasis to supervisors that the component's willingness to hire an applicant is only the initial element of the total decision process. Further, when discussing benefits and entitlements, they would be wise to leave that portion of the interview to the administrative and personnel officers who should be current on Agency employment benefits. Finally, in negotiating entry salary levels, they should keep in mind that the grade and salary for an applicant are subject to final approval by the Office of Personnel. Although we have not had many difficulties in this area, it is always embarrassing to advise an applicant that the grade and salary discussed were higher than could be approved.

F. W. M. Janney Director of Personnel

DD/A Distribution:

1 - Ea Office Director 5 JUN 1975

√1 - DD/A Subject

ST